

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT**

In re CLARA M., a Person Coming Under the  
Juvenile Court Law.

TULARE COUNTY HEALTH AND HUMAN  
SERVICES AGENCY,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

MARINA F.,

Defendant and Appellant.

F067305

(Super. Ct. No. JJV065593B)

**OPINION**

**THE COURT\***

APPEAL from orders of the Superior Court of Tulare County. Juliet L. Boccone,  
Judge.

David Thompson, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and  
Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

-ooOoo-

---

\* Before Poochigian, Acting P.J., Detjen, J. and Franson, J.

Marina F. (mother) appeals from a 2013 order terminating parental rights (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 366.26)<sup>1</sup> to her 14-year-old daughter, Clara. After reviewing the entire record, mother's court-appointed appellate counsel informed this court he could find no arguable issues to raise on mother's behalf. Counsel requested and this court granted leave for mother to personally file a letter setting forth a good cause showing that an arguable issue of reversible error does exist. (*In re Phoenix H.* (2009) 47 Cal.4th 835, 844.)

After the time to file a letter brief expired, this court received a photocopy of a letter apparently from mother in which she asks to regain custody of Clara. According to the letter, mother is "doing what [the] judge ordered." The letter also claims Clara is suffering and needs mother. On review, we conclude the letter does not amount to a good cause showing that an arguable issue of reversible error does exist. (*In re Phoenix H.*, *supra*, 47 Cal.4th at p. 844.) Accordingly, we will dismiss the appeal.

### **PROCEDURAL AND FACTUAL HISTORY**

In the summer of 2011, mother was unable to care for Clara and her older sister. Mother left her daughters without support and failed to provide them with adequate food and shelter. She essentially left her daughters on their own to fend for themselves or stay with relatives.

Consequently, respondent Tulare County Health and Human Services Agency (agency) detained the girls and initiated dependency proceedings for their benefit. The juvenile court soon thereafter exercised its dependency jurisdiction over Clara and her older sister, removed them from parental custody and ordered reunification services for mother. Services included visitation, parenting classes, a substance abuse assessment, and substance abuse testing. Despite a year of services, mother failed to participate in any component of the court's case plan for her.

---

<sup>1</sup> All further statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code unless otherwise indicated.

In July 2012, the court terminated reunification efforts for mother and set a section 366.26 hearing to select and implement a permanent plan for Clara.<sup>2</sup> Although mother received notice of her writ remedy to challenge the court's setting order, mother did not seek extraordinary writ review.

By the time of the eventual section 366.26 hearing, Clara was living with a maternal aunt who desired to adopt her. Clara, who was thriving in her aunt's home, was also in favor of adoption.

Mother had notice of the section 366.26 hearing but did not attend. Having found by clear and convincing evidence that Clara was likely to be adopted, the court terminated parental rights, freeing Clara for adoption.

### **DISCUSSION**

An appealed-from judgment or order is presumed correct. (*Denham v. Superior Court* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 557, 564.) It is up to an appellant to raise claims of reversible error or other defect and present argument and authority on each point made. If an appellant does not do so, the appeal should be dismissed. (*In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952, 994.) Here, mother does not raise any claim of error or other defect against the termination order from which she appealed.

At the termination hearing, the court's proper focus was on Clara to determine whether it was likely she would be adopted and if so, order termination of parental rights. Once reunification services are ordered terminated, the focus shifts to the child's needs for permanency and stability and away from a parent's interest in reunification. (*In re Marilyn H.* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 295, 309.) If, as in this case, the child is likely to be adopted, adoption is the norm. Indeed, the court must order adoption and its necessary consequence, termination of parental rights, unless one of the specified circumstances provides a compelling reason for finding that termination of parental rights would be

---

<sup>2</sup> For Clara's older sister, the court scheduled an emancipation hearing.

detrimental to the child. (*In re Celine R.* (2003) 31 Cal.4th 45, 53.) Here there was no reason for the court to take any action other than to terminate parental rights.

**DISPOSITION**

This appeal is dismissed.